REMARKS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 10-26, as amended, are pending in the application. Claims 10 and 22 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-10 have been canceled. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

The Present Invention

The present invention is directed to monitoring and configuring devices connected in a distributed computer network. The present invention automatically determines the names of variables associated with a selected type of device and provides the values of the variables to a user in a human-understandable language. Independent claim 10 recites a method using a computer system for automatically presenting values of variables from a selected type of device to a user interface. Independent claim 13 recites a method, using a computer system for establishing communication with a device where the language and/or protocol of the device is unknown to the system. Independent claim 22 recites a computer system for communicating with a device using the specific protocol and/or language of the device.

Of importance to understanding the scope of the present invention is that one skilled in the art of software would understand that a "device" is: 10. a mechanism or piece of equipment; 11. a computer peripheral or an object that appears to the application as such. (See IEEE 100, Seventh Edition, page 297).

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 10-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,216 (Ankireddipally et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 presenting facts to establish that the present invention was conceived prior to the effective filing date of Ankireddipally et al. coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to the filing of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Ankireddipally et al. is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicants further submit that Ankireddipally et al. does not disclose all the features of independent claims 10, 13 and 22, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Ankireddipally et al. is directed to an interaction protocol called CXIP for governing the exchange of data between software application services and processes (col. 1, lines 22-29, col. 6, lines 61-67, col. 11, lines 23-25). As shown in Fig. 2 and described at col. 14, line 28 to col. 15, line 18, applications 34 and 20 are commerce exchange components (CXC) in a commerce exchange domain, which exchange XML documents though a server 10. The server 10 operates as a type of clearinghouse, receiving service requests by client components, viz.. application 34 and directing them to service components, viz. application 20. The applications 20, 34 each include a communication module 50 for handling the syntax of the XML documents, and an XML/DOM module 52 which parses the documents and provides a DOM object to application logic 54 for handling each document as a standard program object.

Claim 10

The Examiner initially equates the method disclosed by Ankireddipally et al. for exchanging data between applications to the method for obtaining values of device variables as recited by claim 10.

Amended claim 10 recites a method of using a computer system for automatically presenting values of variables obtained by a data engine from a selected type of device to a user in a human-understandable language, where the computer system includes a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of the variables in the native language of the device into the human understandable form. Ankireddipally et al. discloses a protocol for communicating between applications and does not teach, suggest or disclose communicating with a device. Accordingly, Ankireddipally et al. can not possibly teach, suggest or disclose obtaining the values of device variables from a selected type of device as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner, citing Ankireddipally et al. at col. 2, line 45 to col. 3, line 5, further states that Ankireddipally et al. discloses a data engine which requests the names of device variables for a selected type of device from a data dictionary.

The Examiner in his analysis, appears to be attributing to XML the characteristics of a data engine and/or a data dictionary. However, XML is neither a software module (data engine) or a data dictionary but is merely a data representation standard (structure) that provides

a universal format for structured documents and data. In fact, Ankireddipally et al. describes XML as a data structure used the for exchange of messages in the form of XML documents (col. 12, lines 34-36). In contrast to XML, the data engine of the present invention is a software module that receives device variables in a predetermined system language and translates the received data/variables into a selected human understandable presentation language. Further the data dictionary described in the present application is a well known type of data structure that defines the basic organization of a database. XML, on the other hand, is not a data structure that defines the organization of a database. Accordingly, the Examiner's reference to XML as a data dictionary is misplaced.

The Examiner further states that Ankireddipally et al., at col. 8 line 43 to col. 9, line 25, discloses obtaining by a data agent the values of device variables. However, Ankireddipally et al. at col. 8 describes managing the exchange of structured documents between a requesting application and a service application and not the obtaining of the values of device variables from a device as recited in amended claim 10.

The Examiner also states that Ankireddipally et al., at cols. 12, 15 and 27 discloses obtaining translating information from a data dictionary. However, Ankireddipally et al. merely describes various translations in the system such as translation by the XML/DOM service between XML syntax and an internal data format requirement and translation between TCP/IP and SMTP. However, Ankireddipally et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose accessing a data dictionary to obtain translating information, as recited in amended claim 10.

The Examiner further states that Ankireddipally et al. at col. 25, lines 5-15 discloses a data engine that utilizes translating information from the data dictionary to provide the values of device variables to a user in a human-understandable language. However, Ankireddipally et al. at col. 25 merely discloses viewing Web documents and does not teach, suggest or disclose the process of utilizing information from a data dictionary to translate values of device variables as recited in amended claim 10.

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and MPEP § 2131.

The invention disclosed by Ankireddipally et al. is fundamentally different from the present invention. The present invention is directed to managing devices connected to a distributed computer network. Ankireddipally et al. is directed to managing communications between applications. More specifically Ankireddipally et al. does not disclose either the steps of: (1) requesting the names of device variables from a data dictionary; (2) obtaining values of device variables from a selected device by a data agent; (3) obtaining information for translating value of device variables in the native language of the device into human-understandable form from a data dictionary; or (4) using the translation information to translate the values of device variable into human-understandable form. Consequently, Ankireddipally et al. does not anticipate amended claim 10. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 10.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim10 has been shown to be allowable, claims 11-12 dependent on claim 10 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 11 and 12.

Claim 13

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 based on the same rational as claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection on the same bases as claim 10.

Further, Applicant submits that Ankireddipally et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose a plurality of data agents associated with a specific language or protocol as recited in claim 13. Also, Ankireddipally et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose an iterative process for obtaining values of variables at a selected network address. Accordingly, for all the reasons cited in connection with claim 10 and those above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 10.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim13 has been shown to be allowable, claims 14-21 dependent on claim 13 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 14-21.

Claim 22

The Examiner has rejected claim 22 based on the same rational as claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection on the same bases as claim 10.

Claim 22 recites a computer system for communicating with a device comprising a data engine, a plurality of data agents and a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of device variable in the native language into a human-understandable form.

Further, Applicant submits that Ankireddipally et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose a plurality of data agents, each of which communicates with a device or a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of device variable in the native language into a human-understandable form. Accordingly, for all the reasons cited in connection with claim 10 and those above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 22.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 22 has been shown to be allowable, claims 23-16 dependent on claim 22 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 23-26.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 10-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,094,649 (Bowen et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Bowen et al. is directed to a method and system for supporting keyword searches of data items in a structured database. As shown in Fig. 2, Bowen et al. discloses a structured database 204. Exposure definitions 204 identify portions of the database 204 that will be exposed to keyword searches. The exposure definitions 204 are created, edited and extracted by an administration tool 206. A document generator 208 generates documents 210 from the database 204 which contain textual representations of the exposed data values of data items in the database and locates each of the documents 210 at a URL. An indexing agent 212 reads each of the documents 210 and creates an entry in an index 214 which relates each data item (keyword) in each document to the URL of the corresponding document 210. A keyword search

engine user interface 216 accepts keywords from users and uses the index 214 to locate the documents 210 containing the keywords.

In use (col. 11, line 52 to col. 12, line 40), a keyword is provided by a user to the search engine user interface 216. The search engine 216 accesses the index 214 to determine the location(s) of instances of the data items that match the keyword. Documents 210 containing the instances of the keyword are provided to the search engine for transmission to the user.

Claim 10

The Examiner initially equates the method for supporting keyword searches disclosed Bowen et al. to the method recited by claim 10.

Amended claim 10 recites a method of using a computer system for automatically presenting values of variables obtained by a data engine from a selected type of device to a user in a human-understandable language, where the computer system includes a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of the variables in the native language of the device into the human understandable form.

As stated above, amended claim 10 recites obtaining values of variables from a selected type of device. Bowen et al., however, obtains values of data from a database and does not teach, suggest or disclose obtaining values of device variables from a device. Further, Bowen et al. does not disclose a data dictionary that provides information for translating the values of the device variables in the native language of the device into a human-understandable form.

The Examiner, citing Bowen et al. at col. 7, line 52 to col. 8, line 18, states that Bowen et al. discloses a data engine which requests the names of device variables for a selected type of device from a data dictionary as recited in amended claim 10. However, Bowen et al. at col. 7, line 52 ff. merely describes a data dictionary which contains exposure definitions. Such definitions are described as identifying portions of the database which are to be (or not to be) exposed to keyword searches. Bowen et al. does not describe a data dictionary which provides the names of device variables nor the step of requesting by a data engine the names of device variables, as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner, citing Bowen et al. at col. 8, lines 31-51, further states that Bowen et al. discloses a data agent which obtains values of variables from the selected type of device. However, the indexing agent 214 disclosed by Bowen et al. at col. 8 does not obtain values of

variables from a device as recited in amended claim 10. Rather, the indexing agent 214 obtains values of data items from the documents 210, described at col. 8, lines 21-23 as being in the form of an HTML page, generated by the document generator 208. Further, the indexing agent 212 operates differently from the claimed data agent. The indexing agent 214 is an indexing tool such as a web crawler which merely searches through a file and associates an identifier with each unique type of data item. In contrast, the claimed data agent communicates with a device using the protocol of the device and outputs information obtained from the device in a standard format for presentation to the data engine.

The Examiner, citing Bowen et al. at col. 12, lines 42-60, further states that Bowen et al. discloses obtaining translating information from the data dictionary. However, the data dictionary disclosed at col. 12, lines 42-60 does not provide translation information for translating the values of device variables in the native language of the device into a human-understandable form as recited in amended claim 10. Rather, the data dictionary described at col. 12 merely utilizes a data dictionary 404 to divide the database into portions which will be exposed to indexing and those portions which will not be exposed to indexing. Thus, since the data dictionary does not include translating information, the step of obtaining translating information from the data dictionary is neither taught, suggested or disclosed.

The Examiner further citing Bowen et al. at col. 16, lines 30-40, states that Bowen et al. discloses translating by the data engine the obtained values into human understandable form using the translating information obtained from the data dictionary. However, Bowen et al. at col. 16, merely describes a page generator which displays the information from the database according to a template. It is clear from the description at col. 16 that the template in question determines the placement of information on a display and does not affect translation of the information from the native language of a device into a human-understandable form, as recited in amended claim 10. Further, there is no disclosure at col. 16 of obtaining the parameters of the template from a data dictionary.

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and MPEP § 2131.

The invention disclosed by Bowen et al. is fundamentally different from the present invention. The present invention is directed to managing devices and connected to a

distributed computer network. In contrast Bowen et al. manages documents. More specifically in relation to amended claim 10, Bowen et al. does not disclose either the steps of: (1) requesting the names of device variable from a data dictionary; (2) obtaining values of device variables from a selected device by a data agent; (3) obtaining information for translating value of device variables in the native language of the device into human-understandable form from a data dictionary; or (4) using the translation information to translate the values of device variable into human-understandable form. Consequently, Bowen et al. does not anticipate amended claim 10. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 10.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim10 has been shown to be allowable, claims 11-12 dependent on claim 10 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 11 and 12.

Claim 13

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 based on the same rational as claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection on the same bases as claim 10.

Further, Applicant submits that Bowen et al does not teach, suggest or disclose a plurality of data agents associated with a specific language or protocol as recited in claim 13. Also, Bowen et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose an iterative process for obtaining values of variables at a selected network address. Accordingly, for all the reasons cited in connection with claim 10 and those above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 10.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim13 has been shown to be allowable, claims 14-21 dependent on claim 13 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 14-21.

Claim 22

The Examiner has rejected claim 22 based on the same rational as claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection on the same bases as claim 10.

Claim 22 recites a computer system for communicating with a device comprising a data engine, a plurality of data agents and a data dictionary containing information for

translating the values of device variable in the native language into a human-understandable form.

Bowen et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose a plurality of data agents, each of which communicates with a device or a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of device variable in the native language into a human-understandable form. Accordingly, for all the reasons cited in connection with claim 10 and those above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 22.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 22 has been shown to be allowable, claims 23-16 dependent on claim 22 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 23-26.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 1-26, is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 1-16 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DRAGAN SRETENOVIC

October 11, 2005 By: _____
(Date)

LOUIS SICKLES II
Registration No. 45,803
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1294
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS/lcd